

**From:** [Jay Field](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Benjamin Shorr](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Interpretation of Empirical Bioassay Data at Portland Harbor  
**Date:** 05/29/2009 03:14 PM

---

Eric,  
I checked my database and the values/levels below all match. Possibly the file Ben was using either was based on an earlier version of the reference table (before I received John's table RE-2) or I made a mistake in creating the file for Ben. I hope it didn't cause any problems. I'll check with Ben to see what file he was using.  
Jay

[Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov) wrote:

Jay, over the past two days, we participated in a meeting with the LWG to discuss and reach agreement on AOPCs at the Portland Harbor Site. Based on our data retreat held earlier this month, we determined that for the most part, AOPCs could be identified based on PCBs, B(a)P and sediment toxicity. We assessed sediment toxicity using the bioassay evaluation that you performed based on the reference envelope. This information was converted into a layer in the GIS tool by Ben Shorr.

During our discussions with the LWG, it became apparent that the LWG's interpretation of the bioassays did not match ours. I have attempted to look into this somewhat and it appears to me that the analysis that you performed was consistent with the March 31, 2009 direction that we provided to the LWG.

Table RE-2 in the March 31 direction provided the following criteria for identifying level 1, 2, and 3 hits:

**Table RE-2: Biological effect levels for sediment toxicity test results, in terms of proportional response relative to reference envelope sediments.**

Test	No effect level	Minor effect level	Moderate effect level	Severe effect level
<i>Hyalella azteca</i> 28-day mortality	Survival $\geq 0.895$	$0.895 > \text{survival} \geq 0.806$	$0.806 > \text{survival} \geq 0.716$	Survival $< 0.716$
<i>Hyalella azteca</i> 28-day biomass	Biomass $\geq 0.732$	$0.732 > \text{biomass} \geq 0.659$	$0.659 > \text{biomass} \geq 0.585$	Biomass $< 0.585$
<i>Chironomus tentans</i> 10-day mortality	Survival $\geq 0.948$	$0.948 > \text{survival} \geq 0.854$	$0.854 > \text{survival} \geq 0.759$	Survival $< 0.759$
<i>Chironomus tentans</i> 10-day biomass	Biomass $\geq 0.953$	$0.953 > \text{biomass} \geq 0.856$	$0.856 > \text{biomass} \geq 0.761$	Biomass $< 0.761$

A quick review of some of the AOPCs in question resulted in the following bioassay interpretations:

AOPC 10

G638 - Level 2 hit (Hy biomass) - 61.97%  
G6371 - Level 2 hit (Hy biomass) - 62.65%

AOPC 5

G133 - Level 2 hit (Ch survival) - 81.94%  
G622 - Level 2 hit (Hy biomass) - 64.67%  
G121 - Level 2 hit (Ch survival and biomass) - 83.3 and 83.3%

AOPC 4

G105 - Level 3 hit (Ch survival and biomass) - 68.06 and 61.42%

AOPC2

G6121 - Level 3 hit (Hy biomass) 58.49%  
G061 - Level 2 hit (Hy biomass) - 64.45%  
G613 - Level 2 hit (Hy biomass) - 64.64%

AOPC 8

G155 - Level 3 hit (Ch biomass) 66.40%  
G157 - Level 3 hit (all 4 endpoints) - 14 - 50%  
G160 - Level 3 hit (Ch survival and growth) 19 - 43%  
G161 - Level 3 hit (all 4 endpoints) 30 - 70%

These all seem to match up with the above table. Let me know if I am missing anything.

John Toll may be calling you to discuss this with you and you may need to confirm your evaluation. Please let me know if I am missing anything here. We will likely need to get the results of the LWG bioassay interpretation and have a call between you, John, Burt and myself to resolve this.

Thanks, Eric

--  
Jay Field  
Assessment and Restoration Division  
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA  
7600 Sand Point Way NE  
Seattle, WA 98115-6349  
(P) 206-526-6404  
(F) 206-526-6865  
(E) [jay.field@noaa.gov](mailto:jay.field@noaa.gov)